



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## KING'S STUDIES IN EASTERN HISTORY. I.<sup>1</sup>

BY W. MUSS-ARNOLT,

Belmont, Mass.

This book is the first in a series of small volumes prepared on various epochs in the history of Western Asia, containing, in addition to a number of historical studies, also unpublished documents which throw new light upon the periods of which they treat. We have known thus far next to nothing of Tukulti-Ninib I, the grandson of Adad-Nirari I; and we, therefore, welcome the new inscription, a memorial tablet, which forms the chief attraction in this, handsomely done and well printed, book. For it enlarges, to some extent at least, our so scanty knowledge of the history of Assyria and her relations with Babylonia during the early part of the thirteenth century, B. C.

The text contains an account of the founding, by the king, of the city and the city-wall of Kar-Tukulti-Ninib, situate near the Tigris between Kuyunjik and Kal'a Sherġāt; preceded by a list of the military expeditions which he had conducted up to the time the tablet was engraved. We learn, for the first time, of extensive conquests to the north and east of Assyria, made in a series of expeditions of the king, who closes the narrative of his campaigns by an account of his invasion of Babylonia and the complete subjugation of Sumer and Akkad. The introduction of 76 pages<sup>2</sup> takes up such matters as: (1) Materials for the Early History of Assyria; (2) The Memorial Tablets of Adad-Nirari I<sup>3</sup> and Tukulti-Ninib I; (3) The Historical Value of the New Memorial Tablet; (4) Description of the Tablet;<sup>4</sup> (5) Analysis of the Text; (6) Babylonian and Assyrian Foundation Memorials;<sup>5</sup> (7) Egyptian Foundation Deposits compared; (8) The Foundation Sacrifice; (9) Object and

<sup>1</sup> STUDIES IN EASTERN HISTORY. I: Records of the Reign of Tukulti-Ninib I, King of Assyria, about B. C. 1275. Edited and translated from a memorial tablet in the British Museum (No. 98494) by L. W. King. London: Luzac & Co., 1904. xviii + 185 pp.

<sup>2</sup> Or, rather 56 pages, for 10 leaves are taken up by photographic reproductions of successive portions of the Memorial Tablet. Texts and Translations follow on pp. 78-137; the Cuneiform Texts, pp. 141-175; followed by an index, pp. 177-85. Three times, in this carefully gotten-up index the same misprint Tulkulti, instead of Tukulti, is found.

<sup>3</sup> For which see IV Rawlinson, second edition (= IV<sup>2</sup> R.), pl. 39; KB., Vol. I, pp. 4-9; and R. F. Harper's translation, pp. 10, 11, of his *Assyrian and Babylonian Literature*. P. 3, footnote 1, King says: "Adad-Nirari's slab records the rebuilding of a portion of the temple buildings called the *şirlala*; the exact meaning of the word is uncertain." I believe the word should be read *muşlala* = roof, for which see my Dictionary (= CD.), p. 572, col. 1, and Meissner, *Supplement*, p. 81, col. 2, ll. 1 *sqq.*

<sup>4</sup> To judge from the blunders occurring in this short inscription of 67 lines, we must say that the engraver, who doubtless copied from an exemplar before him, was both inexperienced and inaccurate. In addition to the omissions and errors mentioned by King, some further will be discussed shortly.

<sup>5</sup> With an explanation, for the benefit of the general reader, of the difference between the *temennu*, or inscribed clay cylinder, and the *narû*, or stone memorial tablet. See also CD., pp. 724, 725.

Origin of the Foundation Deposits; (10) Their Manner of Burial; (14) Early Relations of Assyria and Babylonia;<sup>6</sup> (19) Tukulti-Ninib's Successors; and (20) Problems connected with Tukulti-Ninib's rule in Babylon.

To the lexicographer pp. 78-137, containing the texts and translations, are, of course, of chief interest and to a discussion of these we shall devote the major part of this notice.

Pp. 78-95: THE ANNALS OF TUKULTI-NINIB I.<sup>7</sup>

Obverse, 1-8: *Introduction*.—3-4 šar ħur-ša-ni u na-me-e rap-šūti<sup>pl</sup>, "the king of the highlands and of the broad plains." The meaning "plain" for namû is not quite proven. "Surroundings" would be much better; see Hammurabi-letter 30, 11 (a<sup>1</sup>) Ra-ḫa-bu (k<sup>i</sup>) u na-me(ve)-e-šu (and its surroundings, = 𒌦𒍪); III R., pl. 53 a 30 ina (41, 39 eli) ali u na-me-e-šu. K. 2675, rev. l. 9 u-šaḫ-ri-bu na-me-e-šu, *i. e.*, of Jamutbala.—Is šar matu Šu-ba-ri-i 𐎶u-ti-i really correct? We should expect either matu also before 𐎶u-ti-i, or both written as in IV<sup>2</sup> R., pl. 39 a 4, etc.—6. On kib-rat irbitta(ta) see now Jensen, *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), pp. 369, 551, 564, 586, in addition to *CD.*, pp. 368, 369.—i-na šib-baṭ kiš-šu-ti-šu is, of course, to be read, with Johns<sup>8</sup> and Peiser, i-na me-til kiššūtišu; see metlu, *CD.*, p. 623, col. 1 and compare l. 20 of this text i-na li-it kiš-šu-ti-ia, which, without a doubt, is a synonym of the former.—The -ma at the end of l. 8 should be translated: likewise (king of Assyria). On i<sup>lu</sup> Šulmānu(nu)-ašaridu see *CD.*, p. 1045; *KAT.*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 224, 474, 475.

Obverse, l. 9—Reverse, l. 1: *Tukulti Ninib's Campaigns*, closing with the defeat of Bitilashu and the conquest of Sumer and Akkad.—9 (end) read 𐎶u (not Ku)-ti-i—10, 11 matu U-ḫu-ma-ni-i matu El-ḫu-ni-a u matu Šar-ni-da | matu Me-iḫ-ri, etc., "the Uḫumanî and the lands of Elkhunia and Sharnida and Mekhri." Peiser suggests to read Šar-ni DA (= itti, at the side of, Brünnow, No. 6657) matu Me-iḫ-ri, referring to Budge and King's *Annals of the Kings of Assyria*, Vol. I, p. 119, 13, where Tiglath-Pileser is said to have conquered [the land of 𐎶uma]ni as far as the mountain (Peiser and also now King, p. 45, rem. 3: land) of Mekhri (var. Mikhri); and also to Esarh. (I R., pl. 45), col. ii, l. 25 a<sup>1</sup> Me-iḫ-ra-nu, called in the parallel text, III R., pl. 15, col. iii, l. 13 matu Mi-iḫ-ra-nu. Peiser would identify these with

<sup>6</sup> A chapter of great interest and well written. The Bēl-ibni, mentioned on p. 59, ll. 1 sqq., as the first independent king of Assyria whom Esarhaddon describes as "founder of the kingdom of Assyria" is also mentioned in 81-6-7, 209, l. 28, another building inscription, where Esarhaddon calls himself li-ip-li-pi da-ru-u ša Bēl-ba-ni apil A-da-si šar (mât) Aššûr (k<sup>i</sup>), *BAS.*, Vol. III, p. 353.

<sup>7</sup> We doubt not that King, in a second edition of his book, may be induced to change the name "Annals" to that of "Records," or "Laudatory Text," in case he should consider Peiser's remarks, *Orientalistische Literatur Zeitung* (= *OLZ.*), Vol. VIII, cols. 55, 56 (Febr., 1905), as to the point. To be sure, in other instances the author calls the inscription a memorial tablet, p. 76 *et al.* A new edition will, undoubtedly, also give an account concerning the acquisition and place of discovery of this new inscription. By the way, the Adad-Nirari tablet's purchase is discussed in pref. p. ix and p. 2 of the text, not on p. 3.

<sup>8</sup> In his review of King's book, published in the *Jour. of Theol. Studies*, January, 1905, pp. 292 sqq.

the Mekhri of our text. He also suggests changing of Šar (in Šar-ni) into Ẹi-pa-ni, mentioned in Anp., col. iii, ll. 93, 94, assuming a mistake on the part of the engraver who copied from a tablet before him.<sup>9</sup> The chief difficulty in ll. 10, 11 is the strange reading *matu* U-ḡu-ma-ni-i. In Tigl.-Pil., col. vi, 24, we meet the *amēl* Ẹu-ma-ni-i (see, also, col. v, ll. 73, 82) whose city the king captures and whose wide country he conquers (ll. 36, 37). Another instance of the occurrence of this name in a Tigl.-Pil. inscription is given by King, pp. 46, 47. Why here the unusual *matu* U-ḡu-ma-ni-i? I believe that the U- in U-ḡu-ma-ni-i belonged to the next line. The engraver, whose inexperience and carelessness is seen in other instances,<sup>10</sup> copying from an exemplar before him interchanged the beginning of ll. 10 and 11, which must have read originally KUR (= *matu*) Ẹu-ma-ni-i and KUR-u (= *šada*) Me-iḡ-ri. Accepting Peiser's suggestion as to Šar-ni DA we would translate: the land of the Ẹuti, of the Ẹumant, of Elḡunia and of Sharni (or rather, of Kipāni), situate at the side of Mount Mehri. *šada* Me-iḡ-ri I hold to be the correct reading. The meaning of Mehri is correctly indicated by King when he says, p. 46: the country (rather: the mountain region) took its name from the meḡrū-tree, growing in that locality.<sup>11</sup>—14. Peiser: *matu* Kur-ḡi-i instead of *matu* Kur-ḡi-i, connecting it with Kirḡu, Anp., col. iii, 97, 103, etc. Bezold, *Catalogue*, Vol. V., p. 2072. If so, then also Tig.-Pil., col. iii, 47; iv, 12, etc.—17. i-na ra-ap-pi lu-la-iḡ, "with flame I burned." On p. 82 rem. 1, Sennacherib, col. i, l. 8, is also referred to, where the king is described as rap-pu la-'i-iḡ la ma-gi-ri, "the rappu which burns up the disobedient." But all this appears very doubtful.—Peiser very cleverly suggested for l. 17 (end) to read šarrāni<sup>pl.</sup> ša pi-ri[-ik]-šu-nu, the kings of their territory. To be sure, there is no urgent objection against the reading of the text and King's translation; for šapirūtu in the meaning of "government, rule" occurs in Šalm., Monolith, col. i, l. 4—18. Everybody, of course, will read d(t)up-ši-ka as against King's um-ši-ka; see CD., p. 264; d(t)upšikka ēmid = d(t)upšikka u-ša-aš-ši, which occurs so often. See also the use of emēdu in the *deluge*, ll. 184, 185. Peiser's suggestion that the -iḡ of u-šek-iḡ in l. 18, differing in form from the -iḡ in l. 22 (end), is a corrupted contraction of the two characters *ni* and *iḡ*, the fault of the inexperienced engraver, is preferable to King's explanation, p. 83, rem. 3.—19. ḡur-ša-ni be-ru-ti, "highlands and valleys." Peiser assumes here *be-* to be a mistake for *bi* (= *gaš*); if not, then read also Sargon, *Khors.*, 14, etc. huršāni bi (not *gaš*)-ru-ti. King, evidently, considers *be-ru-ti* as

<sup>9</sup> I wonder whether *matu* Ẹi-pa-ni in Anp., col. iii, l. 93, is the name of a country rather than *matu* Ẹi-pa-ni, to be translated simply by province, governed by a Ẹepu, from whom we are informed the king received the tribute of the inhabitants. See also CD., p. 922, col. 1.

<sup>10</sup> See King, p. 10, and *ibid.*, notes 1, 2, and 3.

<sup>11</sup> On the meḡrū-tree see CD., p. 534, col. 1. It was probably an immense mountainous forest-territory, such as we find even today in many countries. Peiser's objection to *šadāni*, instead of *matāti*, is, therefore, groundless, and his reference to ll. 21 *sqq.* unnecessary.

a plural from a singular *bêru*; if so, we should have a rather unusual adjectival plural ending for a plural noun. *hur-ša-ni be-ru-ti* I would rather translate by "deep, dense mountain-forests."<sup>12</sup>—*a-šar la me-te-ki* are "regions where advance is impossible," in meaning equivalent to Tigl.-Pil., col. ii, ll. 73, 74 *ekil pa-aš-ki ša a-na me-tiḫ narkabāti-ia la-a na-ṭu-u*. Compare also the frequently occurring *a-šar la* ('a)-*a-ri*, Senn., col. i, l. 18; IV<sup>2</sup> R., pl. 16 *a 46, 47 ina a-ḫa-a-ti a-šar la a-ri*, etc.—20. The plural *ar-ḫa-te(-šu-nu)*, "roads, paths" from the singular *arḫu* is scarce ever met with. As a rule we find *ar-ḫe* (*ed-lu-ti*, etc.); see Tigl.-Pil., col. iv., l. 50.—Also *dap-ni-iš*, l. 22, is a welcome addition to our lexicographical material; *d(t)a-ap-nu*, adj., is one of the many synonyms of *ḫar-ra-du*, Sm. 2052, col. iii, iv, l. 35.<sup>13</sup> The plural *dap-nu-ti* is read in IV<sup>2</sup> R., pl. 39 *a 3*, Adad-Nirāri *ni-ir d(t)a-p-nu-ti*, "who subjugates the terrible;" unless we agree with Scheil, *Rec. de Travaux*, Vol. XV, pp. 138 *sqq.*, and Streck, *ZA.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 155, 156, that it is a *nomen gentilitium* and translate: "who subjugated Tapnūti."<sup>14</sup>—25 (end). *lu-me-ki-ir*, "I flooded;" see makaru, *CD.*, p. 539, col. 1.<sup>15</sup>—26. With Peiser read perhaps *kul-la-at mātāti-šu-nu*. He also suggests that the exemplar from which the engraver copied read after *bêlê<sup>ph</sup>-ia*, l. 29, as follows: *ana<sup>al</sup> Bābili allikma ina rišūti ša ilu Istar rubāt(at) šamē irḫiti(ti) ša ina pāni šābê<sup>ph</sup>-ia illikū . . . asniḫ*.<sup>16</sup> The twofold occurrence of *alāku* (*allik*, *illiku*) confused the copyist, and hence the present text.—30. On *Bi-be-a-šu* see King, pref., p. x, and pp. 7, 9, 13, 44, 49, 86, 96, etc.<sup>17</sup> It is found abbreviated to *Bi-be*; and is read by Johns, *loc. cit.*, p. 292, and Peiser *Bi-til-(i)a-šu*, the Kassite king of Babylonia.—34. *ki-ma gal-tap-pi*, "like refuse." Both Johns and Peiser have indicated the correct translation of this, the most difficult word in our text. The former refers to *gištappu*, *gilzappu*, *karṭappu*, *kirsappu*, etc.<sup>18</sup>—"a footstool, which," he says, "suits the context well: 'I trampled his lordly neck under my feet like a footstool,'" as a sign of submission the captive allows his conqueror to put his foot upon his neck." Peiser, also, suggests a comparison with Tel-el-Amarna *gi-ir-tab-bu*, *kar-*

<sup>12</sup> *bêru*, adj., almost a synom, in this case, of *gašru*.

<sup>13</sup> See *CD.*, p. 935, col. 1.

<sup>14</sup> On *ṭa(a)pi(i)nu* see *CD.*, p. 357, col. 2. Jensen, *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), p. 310, translates *ū-mu ṭ(d)a-pi-nu* by: "der schreckliche ūmu;" *ibid.*, pp. 48, 49 *ad K. 3454*, ii, l. 35 [*at-ta gaš]-ru* <sup>11</sup> Adad *ṭ(d)a-pi-nu*, he translates: "Du gewaltiger, furchtbarer Adad;" the fem. *ṭa-pi-it-tu* is assumed in *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), p. 50, l. 58.

<sup>15</sup> Notice in this text the occurrence of *e* and *i*, instead of the usual *a*: *u-šik-ši-du* (6); *u-šek-ni-iš* (18); *lu-me-ki-ir* (25); *u-še-im-ḫit* (32); rev.: *u-šek-lil* (8 and 17); *uš-pil-ki* (9); *lu-be-lit* (13); *lu-še-bir* (26); *lu-ši-ḫi-ir* (27); *lu-li-mi-in* (29).—On Hebr. מֶקֶר see Haupt in "Kings" (*SBOT.*), p. 238.

<sup>16</sup> Line 31 (end) read *as-ni-iḫ* (not *-ik*).

<sup>17</sup> See "Index," p. 179, col. 1, end.

<sup>18</sup> *CD.*, pp. 219, col. 2: 308, col. 2; 440, col. 2. *Šamši-Adad*, col. ii, l. 15, etc.

<sup>19</sup> For *gištabb(pp)u*, *girtabb(pp)u*, *galtappu* compare *maštakal*, *martakal* and *maltakal* (*CD.*, p. 614, col. 2); *išdudu*, *irdudu* and *ildudu* from *šadadu*, *ibid.*, p. 1014, col. 2.

tab-bi (ḳardubu) = "groom."<sup>20</sup> The comparison with the obscure similes used by Tiglath-Pileser I in his great Cylinder inscription, mentioned by King, pp. 86, 87, rem. 1, are thus not quite to the point.<sup>21</sup>

Reverse, ll. 2-17: *The Building of Kar-Tukulti-Ninib*.<sup>22</sup>—2. On ebirtu ali-ia see Peiser, *OLZ.*, Febr., 1905, col. 56. On the use of ebirtu compare *CD.*, p. 11, col. 1. In l. 4 we read i-ta-at ba-it ilāni<sup>pl</sup>, "in accordance with the desire of the gods;" but in l. 2, according to King, only ilu Bēl bēlu is mentioned who later on is not spoken of at all as one of the great gods (ll. 6, 7). We wonder whether the text of l. 2 is correct? Does ilu A-šur here belong to ali-ia, as King and others say, or may we assume an original ilu Ašur ilu Bēl EN-MEŠ-ia = bēlē-ia?<sup>23</sup> Then, of course, the use of ilāni<sup>pl</sup> would be quite intelligible.—4. ba-it (ilāni<sup>pl</sup>) is a welcome addition to the instance in Shalm., Monolith, col. i, l. 6 (*CD.*, p. 137, col. 1). The use of i-ta-at in this connection, to be sure, is rather strange.<sup>24</sup>—7. For ilu Imina-bi, i. e., ilu Sibitti šunu, see *KAT.*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 413, 459, 460, 620; and *CD.*, pp. 744, 745.—8. Me-ša-ri, in the meaning of "direct, straight," occurs also in IV<sup>2</sup> R. pl. 58 a 49: "I conjure thee by . . . me-ša-ri re-bit;" 52. me-ša-ru-um-ma, "straightway, directly," *ZA.*, Vol. XVI, pp. 172, 173. This use of mēšaru is quite seldom. Is eš-ri-ti-šu correct? We would expect -šu-nu, or nothing at all.—Peiser translates ll. 9-11 ḫi-ši-ib . . . ar-ku-us: "mit der Wasserfülle dieser Leitung machte ich den grossen Göttern, meinen Herrn, auf ewig eine gesetzmässige Stiftung."—11. ḳa-ḳa-ra-te (ma-da-te) is a most interesting plural. We usually find ḳaḳ-ḳa-ru ma-'du, Esarh., col. v, l. 6, etc.; Neb. (*EIH.*), col. vi, ll. 25, 26: 4000 ammat ga-ga-ri i-ta-a-ti Bābili; col. viii, ll. 45, 46.—12. The reading of ilu Nabū is not so certain. The group in Brūnnow, 2291, is quite different from

<sup>20</sup> "Pferdeknecht; von kiršabbu, Fusschemel etymologisch, aber nicht sachlich zu trennen und als Pferdiedner zu fassen. Tukulti-Ninib trat auf den Nacken des Bitlāshu wie auf den eines Pferdeknechtes, der sich auf die Erde kniet und dem König seinen Nacken als Schemel darbietet, damit er sein Ross besteigt."

<sup>21</sup> ki-ma šut-ma-ši(še), "like chaff," is translated by Feuchtwang, *ZA.*, Vol. V, p. 91: "like sheaves," comparing Hebr. שֵׂה מִיִּם. Meissner, *ZA.*, Vol. VIII, p. 80, following Delitzsch, *Grammatik*, § 65, No. 40b, derives the word from a root š-m-š. Streck, *ZA.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 167, translates: "Gewimmel, Ameisenhaufen," or the like, i. e., "Bezeichnung einer ausserordentlich grossen Heeresmacht." So also Hommel, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, p. 156, rem. 4.—Delitzsch, *Grammatik*, § 65, No. 40, cites also šut-me-ši, K. 13 rev. 10 (= IV<sup>2</sup> R. pl. 45 b 43; Harper, *Letters*, 281), read by Johnston, *Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, Vols. XVIII, p. 141; XIX, p. 81, and by *BAS.*, Vol. IV, pp. 527 sqq., ŠE-BAR šib-ši, "corn-tax" (*CD.*, p. 1006, col. 2), ša māt Elamti gabbi, etc. Streck, *ZA.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 67, again reads šut-me-ši.—On ki-ma šu(-u)-be(bi), "like standing corn(?)," see *CD.*, p. 1000, col. 2.—ki-ma zi-ir-ḳi, King, "like swathes(?)," with *CD.*, p. 297, col. 2; where, however, the possibility is suggested of translating "like lambs," agreed to by Streck, *ZA.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 171, 172, who compares it to azliš unakkis.

<sup>22</sup> See, also, Introduction, pp. 40-43.

<sup>23</sup> Obv. l. 28 we read ilu A-šur ilu Bēl u ilu Šamaš ilāni rabūti<sup>pl</sup> bēlē<sup>pl</sup>-ia.

<sup>24</sup> If it were possible to explain ba-it ilāni<sup>pl</sup> in the sense of the later(?) bait-ili = bit-ili, see *KAT.*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 437, 438, it would be much easier to understand these lines. L. 4 would then mean: "In addition to (literally: with, at the side of) the house of the gods, commanded by Bēl(?), I built a great city, a royal dwelling-place."

the one here exhibited.—12, 13. ti-ik-pi. We usually find in its stead ti-ib-ki, *e. g.*, I R., pl. 44, l. 62: three šūš xx (= 200) ti-ib-ki; Sargon, Silver, l. 38; Senn., Rass., ll. 81, 82; Bull-inscr., ll. 53, 54. Ašur-rêš-iši, *KB.*, Vol. I, p. 12, ll. 10, 11: fifteen ti-ib(p)-ki; and many other instances.<sup>25</sup> *KB.*, Vol. I, p. 216, suggests that in Anp., col. ii, l. 132 (and iii, l. 136): 120 tik-pi a-na muš-pa-li lu-ṭa-bi is a mistake for tibki; but tik-pi and variant ti-ik-pi also occur in Anp., Stand., l. 17; twice here in our text, and other instances.—13. lu-be-lit, Piel of balātu, 1 (*CD.*, p. 168, col. 1), occurs in Qal also in King, *Magic*, No. 12, l. 56, ba-aš-ti tab-la-tu; 45, l. 9; 62, l. 7, e-peš pī-ku-nu ba-la-tu-um-ma.—14. êkal me-ḫi-ra, “a palace corresponding to the size thereof.” K 2971 c 18 (IV<sup>2</sup> R., pl. 56) we read lu-u pa-aš-ša-a-ti šaman mi-ix-ri, translated in *ZA.*, Vol. XVI, p. 163: “mögest du mit vorzüglichem(?) Oel gesalbt werden.” If this be correct, we could translate here: “a splendid palace.”—bīt kiš-ša-ti, “a mighty house;” but this would rather be bīt kiš-šu-ti; see *CD.*, pp. 454, 455. Perhaps it is to be explained like alu kiš-ša-ti, III R., pl. 54, No. 6, l. 30, *KAT.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 30, rem. 1.<sup>26</sup>—šu-bat šarru-ti-ia is also an apposition to êkal and must not be translated: “for my royal habitation;” that would rather be ana šūbat šarrūtīia.—16. ri-ši-ib-tu be-lu-ti-ia, “the fortress of my dominion,” a welcome lexicographical addition.

Reverse, ll. 18–30: *Conclusion*.—18. read e-nu(not -na)-ma.—19. an-ḫu-su is “the damaged part (not, parts) thereof.”—20. On šamni pašāšu see Haupt in *Isaiah* (*SBOT.*), p. 82, l. 7; *CD.*, pp. 846, 847.—21. On ana ašrišu tāru, the equivalent of Heb. אֲשֵׁרִישׁוּ תָאֲרֻךְ, consult Haupt in *Kings* (*SBOT.*), p. 199, ll. 40–42.—22 (end). read na-ri-ia (not -a).—23. u-ša-sa-ku is an unusual spelling, instead of u-ša-am-sa-ku, from masaku, *CD.*, p. 567; *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), pp. 386, 387.

Pp. 96–121: SUPPLEMENTARY TEXTS. The texts treat of the history and date of Tukulti-Ninib I. They are:

a) *The Babylonian Chronicle* (82–7–4, 38),<sup>27</sup> col. iv, ll. 1–13.—In l. 1 King has succeeded in deciphering the name of Bibeishu, which had escaped the notice of former editors and translators.—5. The treasures of Esaggil and of Babylon ina sil-lat uš-te-ši, “He profanely brought forth;” translate either: “in impudence,” or “as spoil;” see *CD.*, pp. 764, col. 2; 1050, col. 1. If ilu Bêl rabû ilu Marduk means: “the great lord Marduk,” it is a rather strange wording. We would expect ilu Marduk bêlu rabû; ll. 11 and 12 do not militate against this. If, however, it means Bêl, the great, and Marduk, then l. 6 must read [ana] šub-ti-šu, the -šu referring to Tukulti-Ninib.—u-za-as-siḫ = Ishtafal of nasahu, for uštassiḫ.

b) *Synchronous History*.—S. 2106.<sup>28</sup>—4. King reads ŠI-ŠI-šu as

<sup>25</sup> See Delitzsch, *Hwb.*, pp. 699, 700, and my *CD.*, Part XVIII.

<sup>26</sup> Or, are we to read bīt [šar] kiš-ša-ti? Omissions of this kind are not unknown in this tablet.

<sup>27</sup> So also read on p. 60, l. 15.

<sup>28</sup> Transliteration and translation published also in *KB.*, Vol. I, pp. 196, 197, col. i, ll. 24 sqq.

pānātu-šu im-ḥa-aš. It is usually read either ši-lim-šu<sup>29</sup> or ideographically = abikta-šu.<sup>30</sup>—<sup>il</sup>u urigallē<sup>pl</sup>-šu i-bu-ga-šu, "his priests he captured from him." amēl urigallu, to be sure, is some sort of a priest; but <sup>il</sup>u urigallu alone is "a standard," probably "a portable tutelary deity."<sup>31</sup> See Zimmern, *Ritualtafeln*, p. 126, rem. 9, to No. 26, l. 24, ḫān urigalla; also p. 140, No. 31-37, ii, ll. 5 and 8. Thureau-Dangin, *ZA.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 130, rem. 1: "hampe bouclée;" cf. Heuzey, *Rev. d'Assyriologie*, Vol. V, p. 132.—Read i-pu-ga-šu and see *CD.*, 790, col. 1: pāgu, l.—5. the translation in *KB.*, Vol. I, p. 195, col. 1, l. 28, is, I believe, more correct than King's rendering.—6. iš-tu tar-ši . . . a-di, see also Tigl.-Pil., col. v, l. 47.—7. am-ma-ma-te is evidently a mistake for am-ma-te.<sup>32</sup>—K 4401b.<sup>33</sup> 5. ina ḫabal-ti [i]-du-ku-ma, so King, following *KB.*, *loc. cit.*; but Johns maintains that such an omission is not necessary to assume. Du-ku could be read italla-ku. At any rate, it would seem rather strange to have the verb mean "they fought" (l. 4); and "he did slay" (l. 5).

c) *The famous copy of Tukulti-Ninib's seal-inscription* from a clay tablet of the time of Sennacherib, by means of which the date of Tukulti-Ninib is fixed approximately. It is labeled K 2673 and published in III R., pl. 4, No. 3.<sup>34</sup>—2. kišitti(ti) mātū Kar-du,<sup>35</sup> "booty from the land of Kardu[nishi?]." See *CD.*, 453, col. 1, § 2, where it is translated by "the conqueror of," referring to Tukulti-Ninib; so also Tiele, *Geschichte*, p. 147; Meissner and Rost, *BAS.*, Vol. III, p. 214; but Lehmann, *Zwei Hauptprobleme*, questions this again; see also Jensen, *Gött. Gelehrt. Anz.*, 1900, p. 852, rem. 1. Streck, *ZA.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 161, agrees with Meissner and Rost.—mu-ni-kir is probably better than mu-na-kir, suggested by Peiser, *KB.*, Vol. I.<sup>36</sup> See for this form also p. 67, rem. 1.—4. gar-ri ik-ta-din, "the enemy carried away."<sup>37</sup> In *CD.*, 653, col. 2, below,<sup>38</sup> the correct reading is given as ša-ri-ik ta-din. So also Johns: "was stolen (and) taken;" and Streck, *ZA.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 160, 161.—7. us-si-ši-aš-šu for uštēši aššu, "I carried it away."—Edge and rev. 4 are the interesting lines of this inscription, read by King: makkur Ša-ga-ra-a-k-ti-Šur-ia-aš<sup>39</sup> šar kiššati. For a full discussion of this line, see King, pp. 65 sqq.

<sup>29</sup> So Schrader, *KB.*, Vol. II, p. 6, l. 12; Bezold, *ibid.*, p. 82, l. 21; Hincks, *Amiaud*; Haupt and others. See *CD.*, p. 1045, col. 2: Šilmu, l.

<sup>30</sup> So Jensen; King in this book, p. 111, l. 21; and others.

<sup>31</sup> See Johnston, *Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, Vol. XX, pp. 251, 252; *CD.*, p. 790, col. 1; Delitzsch, *Hwb.*, p. 720, col. 1, below; Johns, *Jour. of Theol. Studies*, January, 1905, p. 295.

<sup>32</sup> See Delitzsch, *Die Sprache der Kossaeer*, p. 10; and *Rec. Past*<sup>2</sup>, Vol. IV, p. 29, rem. 2.

<sup>33</sup> Published also in *KB.*, Vol. I, pp. 196, 197, col. ii, ll. 1 sqq.

<sup>34</sup> See King, "Introduction," pp. 60, 63-72. Transliteration and translation also in *KB.*, Vol. I, pp. 10, 11. In addition to the literature mentioned by King, pp. 65, 66, see also *Gött. Gelehrt. Anz.*, 1889, p. 868; and *ZA.*, Vol. IV, p. 90.

<sup>35</sup> Rev., l. 2, we read mātū Kar-du-ni-ši. See also Karduniaš, *CD.*, p. 429, col. 2.

<sup>36</sup> On the basis of *KB.*, Vol. I, p. 4, No. 5, l. 3, ša . . . u-na-ka-rum.

<sup>37</sup> So Tiele; Peiser, *KB.*, Vol. I, p. 11, rem. 5; *KAT*<sup>2</sup>, p. 454, rem., *Rev. Sémitique*, Vol. VII, p. 134, § 33.

<sup>38</sup> Against, *ibid.*, pp. 372, 373.

<sup>39</sup> The father of Bitil(i)ashu.



There is not the slightest reason to suppose that King has not found this reading, independent of Delitzsch.<sup>40</sup> We cannot but believe his statement<sup>41</sup> that he has made out the meaning of this line of archaic characters which has puzzled translators of the text during the last thirty years.

d) *Accounts of the Capture of Babylon by Sennacherib*, on one of which he recovered the seal of Tukulti-Ninib I.—a. The capture in 702 B. C., from 55-10-3, 1 (= I R., pl. 37), col. i, ll. 19-36.<sup>42</sup> It is a great pity that King has not followed the fine example of Bezold in giving the variant readings for which students of the Sennacherib texts will always be thankful to the editor of the *Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie*.—28. According to Bezold also 55-10-3, 1, reads TAG (= abnu) before a-ḫar-tu. This changes, of course, the translation somewhat.—29. That ŠA(=GAR)-ŠU(=ḲAT) is an ideogram is not yet beyond doubt. It may be šāšu, a synonym of bušū. See also Senn., col. ii, l. 56, where the variant ša-a-šu occurs. The libbi-ekalli<sup>pl.</sup>-šu are perhaps the šigrēti, the ladies of the harem (Haupt); see CD., p. 1011, col. 1; or zikrēti; so Delitzsch, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1904, No. 49, cols. 3031, 3032, on Hammurabi-code, §§ 178, 180, <sup>sal</sup> zi-ik-ru-um, a woman. The zikrēti were the concubines (Nebenfrauen)<sup>43</sup> of king (or priests) in addition to the wife, the ḫirtu.—30. I am somewhat surprised that King does not mention—in parentheses at least—the Assyrian reading of amēlu GAL-TE<sup>pl.</sup>, certainly known to him. See Brünnow, No. 6865 on II R., pl. 51, cols. d-f, 47 = ti-i-ru-m and man-za-az(-)pa-ni.<sup>44</sup>—On zammaru, zammeru, see also KAT.<sup>3</sup>, p. 590; Zimmern, *Ritualtafeln*, pp. 93, 174-87; KB., Vol. VI (1), p. 387; CD., p. 284, col. 2; Bezold, *Catalogue*, p. 1758 (81-2-4, 65).—si-ḫir-ti, a genitive instead of the c. st. (siḫrat). um-ma-ni is scarcely = servants.<sup>45</sup>—β. The capture in 689 B. C., from the Bavian inscription, ll. 43-54. These lines, together with the rest of the inscription, were thoroughly revised and collated by the author in the spring of 1894. The edition of this text has not yet been published. It is based upon the text of the tablet which is highest up in the gorge, and is restored from the other two duplicate tablets, the central and that nearest to the mouth of the gorge. The text shows many improvements upon former editions,<sup>46</sup> and we hope that King will not delay the publication of his edition of this important inscription. Lines 43-50 have been edited by Bezold in KB.,

<sup>40</sup> In his article, "Assur," published on p. 39 of the *Mittheilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, No. 20, December, 1903. See Peiser's remarks, *OLZ.*, loc. cit., col. 55, rem. 1: "Falls sie (the interpretation) von ihm (i. e., King) stammt!"

<sup>41</sup> Preface, p. xi.

<sup>42</sup> See KB., Vol. II, pp. 82-85.

<sup>43</sup> R. F. Harper, *The Code of Hammurabi*, pp. 65, 67: a devotee.

<sup>44</sup> See CD., p. 562, col. 1, for other instances. Also K. 13583, 4 in Meissner's *Supplement*, pl. 17. King, *Magic*, Nos. 9, l. 15; 22, l. 16, and 18, l. 9. Tiru and manzaz pāni are, apparently, almost synonyms.

<sup>45</sup> CD., p. 58, u(m)mānu, 1; Jensen, KB., Vol. VI (1), p. 457; Vol. IV, p. 192 (Neb. 233, l. 5).

<sup>46</sup> So in l. 45; but is it too hazardous to restore, with Bezold, ak-šu-ud after ḳataḫ-[a-a]? <sup>46</sup> ga-du, instead of adi. 52 and 53.

Vol. II, pp. 116-19.—47. read ni(not mi)-siḫ-ti.—57. AN-GIŠ-BAR is to be read girru rather than <sup>11</sup> Gibil. See *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), pp. 8, l. 37, and rem. 2, *ibid.*; 390, 391; also *KAT.*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 364, rem. 2; 417, rem. 5; 562. Perhaps = ḫirru, √ḫḫ, for which see *CD.*, pp. 933, 934.—Instead of ak-mu read aḫ-mu—54 (end), “I destroyed (it) so that it became like unto a swamp.” That u-s(š)al-lu means “swamp” is not so certain. See *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), pp. 498, 499; *KB.*, Vol. IV, pp. 138, No. iv, l. 7 (K 317), where is mentioned “a property (a piece of land) consisting of six acres of land ina u-s(š)al-la” (Peiser here: “am Stadtrande”); 168, No. ii, l. 3, “the field of Bit-I-bu-ni ultu eli du-uk-ku-di-in-du a-na u-s(š)al-la (Peiser: zum Ufergebiet) of the Dubata-river.” See also p. 270, No. ix (Cyrus 174), 3, where ša u-s(š)al-la can scarcely mean “swamp” (Peiser: “von dem Felde”).

Pp. 123-37: APPENDIX. It contains nine fragments, the first four of which belong to a bowl-inscription of Shalmaneser I (about 1300 B. C.), recording the restoration of the great temple of Ishtar at Nineveh. On p. 124 the author severely criticizes some statements concerning these made by Johns in his article “Nineveh” in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. III (1902), cols. 3422 sq. It is most pleasing to observe the kindly acknowledgment of his mistake and acquiescence in this censure by Johns in his review of King’s book.<sup>47</sup> The texts are very fragmentary, and it is with great cleverness that King, pp. 130-32, pieces together a restoration of the original text. Lexicographically No. 3 (56-9-9, 187) shows in l. 5 the interesting plural an-ša-ti-šu ak-sir u ma-aḫ[-te . . .], “the breaches I filled up and that which was fallen;” No. 4 (S. 2115), l. 4, ina ri-i-bit.—Pp. 133-36 are published, for the first time, two other building-inscriptions of Shalmaneser, found on fragments of bowls in the British Museum. They are numbered S. 2125 and Rm. 2606, where l. 3 shows the plural ša-]ap-ra-ti, “tributary gifts.”—7 (end) read e-nu(not mu)-ma.—8. iḫ-tab-tu si-kur-ra-te, “the enclosed spaces had been rifled.” Johns prefers to read ‘i-tab-tu (√abatu), “and when the clamps had parted” (literally: carried themselves away). Three more fragments follow, exhibiting no special features.

This notice has grown greatly beyond the limits of space allowed even by the generous editor of this JOURNAL. That such is the case constitutes for author and the readers of his book the best proof of the great interest which its contents have elicited from the writer. We sincerely hope that Mr. King will soon follow up this initial volume with others. The book is almost luxurious in its make-up, and perhaps a trifle more expensive than Assyriologists are wont to pay for books of this size.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>47</sup> *Jour. of Theol. Studies*, January, 1905, p. 293.—But 1845 B. C. in l. 17 of p. 124 of King’s book is undoubtedly a misprint of King’s, not of Johns.

<sup>48</sup> But it scarcely deserves the scathing criticism of Peiser, printed in the first instalment of his review, *OLZ.*, Vol. VIII, No. 2, February, 1905, cols. 54, 55.